

## **REMARKS**

Claims 6, and 26-61 are pending in this application, with Claims 6, 26, 29, 34, 35, and 45 being independent. Claims 1-5 and 7-25 were previously cancelled. In this Amendment, Claims 29-33, 40-43 and 53-57 have been withdrawn from consideration and Claims 60 and 61 have been newly added. In addition, the specification was amended to attend to a minor informality therein. All of the amendments presented herein are made for reasons of clarity with respect to the specification, and not for reasons relating to the statutory requirements for patentability.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claim 6 is allowed, and that Claims 27-28, 34-39, 45, and 53-58 contain allowable subject matter. This Amendment is being submitted in an earnest attempt to place this application in condition for allowance.

The specification was objected to because of a linguistic informality described in the Office Action. Without conceding the propriety of the objection, Applicants have amended the specification.

Claims 29-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants submit that the claim amendments presented above address each of the various grounds of rejection.

Claims 29, 31-33, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by either Roesky et al. or Dhingra et al. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants submit that these claims have been withdrawn from consideration, without any prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Claims 26, 29-33, 40-43, and 48-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Michot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,916,475). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants submit that Claim 26 has been amended to include subject matter from allowable Claim 27. Claims 29-33 and 40-43 have been withdrawn from consideration, without any prejudice to or disclaimer of the

subject matter contained therein. Claims 48-52 have been amended to depend from allowable Claim 45.

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Michot et al. in view of Hamrock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,063,522). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot in view of the amendment to Claim 44, which now depends from allowable Claim 45, which in turn has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the base claim. However, Applicants reserve the right to re-present the subject matter of original Claim 44 in a continuing application.

Claims 29-33 and 40-42 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as obvious in view of Claims 1-44 of Michot et al. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants submit that Claims 29-33 and 40-42 have been withdrawn from consideration, without any prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.


Finally, Claim 59 was not treated in the Office Action, but Applicants believe it to be allowable for the same reasons as Claim 58, from which it depends.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt issuance of a notice thereof is respectfully requested.

If anything further is believed necessary to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Patent Administrator  
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
525 West Monroe Street  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Dawn C. Hayes  
Registration No.: 44,751